

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated August 18, 2010 (“Office Action”). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-40 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-40. Applicants amend Claims 1, 7, 9, 15, 17, 24, 27, 28, 32, 36, and 40 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending Claims.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 6, 9, 14, 17, 22, 23, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,922,786 B1 issued to Ong (“*Ong*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,280,540 B2 issued to Halme, et al. (“*Halme*”), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0032271 A1 in the name of Allen (“*Allen*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for several reasons, as discussed further below.

For example, Claim 1 recites:

A method for tracking telecommunication services comprising:  
receiving at a filter node a call packet from a first node included in a plurality of nodes, wherein the call packet includes a call identifier identifying a call associated with the call packet;  
determining at the filter node a filter status of the call;  
registering the first node and a second node with the filter node in response to receiving an open message, the open message identifying a node operable to receive messages from the filter node, the registering the first node and the second node enabling the filter node to communicate one or more filter statuses to the registered first and second nodes;  
determining at the filter node, based on stored dynamic node information, to which of the plurality of the nodes to transmit one or more notification messages;  
transmitting, based on the determination, the one or more notification messages from the filter node to the first node from which the call packet was received and a the second node, wherein the notification messages identify the call identifier and the filter status of the call and wherein the notification messages conform to a protocol that primarily communicates tracking information; and  
forwarding the call packet to the second node.

The proposed *Ong-Halme-Allen* combination fails to disclose every element of Claim 1. For example, the proposed *Ong-Halme-Allen* combination fails to disclose “registering the first

node and a second node with the filter node in response to receiving an open message, the open message identifying a node operable to receive messages from the filter node, the registering the first node and the second node enabling the filter node to communicate one or more filter statuses to the registered first and second nodes.” As another example, the proposed *Ong-Halme-Allen* combination fails to disclose “determining at the filter node, based on stored dynamic node information, to which of the plurality of the nodes to transmit one or more notification messages.” As a result, the proposed *Ong-Halme-Allen* combination fails to disclose every element of Claim 1.

Claim 1 and its dependent claims are therefore allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 9, 17, 27, and their dependent claims are allowable for at least analogous reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 9, 17, 27 and their respective dependent claims.

Claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 24-26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Ong*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,103,045 B2 issued to Lavigne, et al. (“*Lavigne*”), and further in view of *Allen*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for several reasons, as discussed further below.

Claim 7 recites:

A method for tracking telecommunication services comprising:  
receiving a request message at a first filter node from a first remote node included in a plurality of nodes, wherein the request message includes a call identifier;  
in response to receiving the request message, determining, at the first filter node whether the first filter node possesses a filter status associated with the call identifier;  
registering the first remote node with the filter node in response to receiving an open message, the open message identifying a node operable to receive messages from the first filter node, the registering the first node enabling the first filter node to communicate filter statuses to the registered first remote node;  
determining, at the first filter node, based on stored dynamic node information, to which of the plurality of the nodes to transmit one or more acknowledgement messages;  
in response to determining that the first filter node possesses a filter status associated with the call identifier:  
determining, at the first filter node, a filter status associated with the call identifier; and  
transmitting an acknowledgement message to the remote node from which the request message was received, wherein the

acknowledgement message identifies the filter status and wherein the acknowledgement message conforms to a protocol that primarily communicates tracking information; and

in response to determining that the first filter node does not possess a filter status associated with the call identifier, indicate to the remote node a second filter node that possesses a filter status associated with the call identifier.

The proposed *Ong-Lavigne-Allen* combination fails to disclose every element of Claim 7. For example, the proposed *Ong-Lavigne-Allen* combination fails to disclose “registering the first remote node with the filter node in response to receiving an open message, the open message identifying a node operable to receive messages from the first filter node, the registering the first node enabling the first filter node to communicate filter statuses to the registered first remote node.” As another example, the proposed *Ong-Lavigne-Allen* combination fails to disclose “determining, at the first filter node, based on stored dynamic node information, to which of the plurality of the nodes to transmit one or more acknowledgement messages.” As a result, the proposed *Ong-Lavigne-Allen* combination fails to disclose every element of Claim 7.

Claim 7 and its dependent claims are therefore allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 15, 24, 28, and their respective dependent claims are allowable for at least analogous reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 7, 15, 24, 28, and their respective dependent claims.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge the **\$810.00** Request for Continued Examination Fee, the **\$130.00** One Month Extension of Time Fee, and to the extent necessary, charge any additional required fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye  
Reg. No. 45,460

Date: December 20, 2010

Correspondence Address:

at Customer No.

**05073**